

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,218,746, issued to Gouge.

With regard to claims 1 and 6, Applicants note that the claims have been amended to require that the first bevel gear be integral to the armature. Support for this can be found in the drawings (see, for example, Figures 3 and 6), as well as in the specification as filed (see, for example, paragraph 0017). This eliminates the need for bearings and a coupling device in order for the armature to drive the gears. Gouge does not teach or suggest that the armature be integral to the first bevel gear. Rather, Gouge clearly requires a plurality of shafts (see elements 39 and 42) between the armature and the first bevel gear. Further, Gouge shows a two-speed planetary gear reduction assembly (element 40) between the armature and the first bevel gear. In view of the amendment to claims 1 and 6, Applicants submit that claims 1 and 6 are now in condition for allowance and respectfully request allowance of the same.

With respect to claims 2-5 and 7-9, Applicants note that these claims are directed to allowable dependencies from patentable base claims (claims 1 and 6). As such, these claims are also in condition for allowance. Applicants further note that claims 4 and 8 have been amended to correct clerical errors. Claims 4 and 8 have not been amended for any reason concerning the patentability of the claims.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected claims 10-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,218,746, issued to Gouge.

With respect to claim 10, Applicants note that claim 10 requires the first and second reducers (comprising first and second bevel gears) to be adjacent to the armature. Gouge neither

teaches nor suggests this arrangement. As has been noted with respect to claims 1 and 6, above, Gouge clearly requires a plurality of shafts (see elements 39 and 42) between the armature and the first bevel gear. Further, Gouge shows a two-speed planetary gear reduction assembly (element 40) between the armature and the first bevel gear. Since Gouge does not disclose even a first reducer adjacent to the armature, Gouge cannot render obvious the arrangement claimed in claim 10 of the present application, which requires not only a first reducer adjacent to the armature, but also a second reducer adjacent to the armature. Thus, Applicants submit that claim 10 is allowable over Gouge. Applicants note that claim 10 has been amended to correct a clerical error. Claim 10 has not been amended for any reason concerning the patentability of the claim.

With respect to claims 11-14, Applicants note that these claims are directed to allowable dependencies from a patentable base claim (claim 10). As such, these claims are also in condition for allowance. Applicants further note that claim 13 has been amended to correct a clerical error. Claim 13 has not been amended for any reason concerning the patentability of the claim.

New Claims

Applicants have added new claims 15 and 16. These claims correspond to original claims 4 and 5, rewritten in independent form. The Examiner states that Gouge discloses a first and second bevel gear that engage at a concave angle (Fig. 14) and a convex angle (Fig. 16). This is not the case. The arrangement shown in Fig. 14 clearly shows the bevel gears engaging at a ninety-degree angle. As the gears are beveled, the teeth of the gears do describe an angle, however that is not what determines the angle of engagement. Looking to shafts 42 and 52, it is clear that the gears are engaged at a ninety-degree angle. Further, the solid lines defining the front and rear (or top and bottom) edges of the gears clearly indicate a ninety degree angle. Fig.

16 does not show bevel gears at all, but rather illustrates a worm gear. Thus, Fig. 16 cannot disclose bevel gears engaging at either a concave or convex angle. There is nothing in Gouge to either teach or suggest bevel gears engaging at a concave or convex angle. Thus, Applicants submit that new claims 15 and 16 are allowable over Gouge and respectfully request allowance of the same. No new matter has been added.

In light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims of the present application have overcome the Examiner's rejections and that the application is in condition for allowance.


Applicants respectfully request consideration of the Remarks set forth herein. Please acknowledge receipt by returning the enclosed postcard.

Respectfully submitted,

SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP

October 21, 2004

By:


Brian R. McGinley
Reg. No. 47782

SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
PO Box #061080
Wacker Drive Station
Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
(816) 460-2400